

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 PATRICK NEWELL,

7 Petitioner,

8 v.

9 ISIDRO BACA, *et al.*,

10 Respondents.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00662-MMD-WGC

ORDER

11
12 Before the Court is Petitioner Patrick Newell's motion for an evidentiary hearing
13 ("Motion") (ECF No. 56). He filed this as part of his reply (ECF No. 55) in support of his
14 *pro se* 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition ("Petition") (ECF No. 6).¹ As discussed
15 below, the Motion is denied.

16 **I. Background & Procedural History**

17 On June 19, 2014, a jury convicted Newell of battery with use of a deadly weapon
18 resulting in substantial bodily harm (Count Two), attempted assault with a deadly weapon
19 (Count Three), and performance of an act in reckless disregard of persons or property
20 resulting in substantial bodily harm (Count Four). (ECF No. 21-3 at 2–3.)² The jury found
21 Newell not guilty of attempted murder with a deadly weapon (Count One). (*Id.* at 2.) The
22 convictions stemmed from an incident where a large, drunk, belligerent 35-year-old man
23 was harassing 65-year-old Newell for a ride at a gas station. (See e.g., ECF No. 21-1 at
24 10–16.) The situation devolved, and Newell doused the victim with gasoline and lit him on
25

26
27 ¹The Court has reviewed Respondents' response in opposition to the Motion. (ECF
No. 58.)

28 ²Exhibits referenced in this order are exhibits to Respondents' motion to dismiss
(ECF No. 18) and are found at ECF Nos. 19–23.

1 fire, causing severe injuries. The state district court sentenced Newell to 72–180 months
2 for Count Two and 24–60 months for Count Three, to run concurrently. (ECF No. 22-5 at
3 20.) Count Four was dismissed as redundant. (*Id.*) Judgment of conviction was filed on
4 August 29, 2014. (ECF No. 22-6.)

5 In his federal habeas petition, Newell raises one issue—he argues that the Nevada
6 courts’ retroactive application of limitations on the justifiable use of deadly force violated
7 his constitutional due process rights against ex post facto violation. (ECF No. 6, ECF No.
8 32 at 4.) This Court denied Respondents’ motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 32.) Respondents
9 answered the petition. (ECF No. 42.) Newell filed his reply/motion for evidentiary hearing
10 (ECF Nos. 55, 56.)

11 **II. Legal Standards**

12 An evidentiary hearing is authorized under Rule 8(a) of the Rules Governing
13 Section 2254 Cases for the development of a colorable claim when the state court has not
14 reliably found the relevant facts and the claim, if proved, would entitle the petitioner to
15 relief. *Schriro v. Landrigan*, 550 U.S. 465, 474 (2007). If the record belies the petitioner’s
16 factual allegations, or precludes habeas relief, an evidentiary hearing is unnecessary. *Id.*
17 The Ninth Circuit has also found that on issues that can be resolved from the record, an
18 evidentiary hearing is not necessary. *Totten v. Merkle*, 137 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir.
19 1988).³

20 ///

21
22
23 ³To determine whether to grant an evidentiary hearing, the Court may consider six
24 factors: (1) the merits of the factual dispute were not resolved in the state hearing; (2)
25 the state factual determination is not fairly supported by the record as a whole; (3) the
26 fact-finding process employed by the state court was not adequate to afford a full and
27 fair hearing; (4) there is a substantial allegation of newly discovered evidence; (5) the
28 material facts were not adequately developed at the state court hearing; and (6) for any
reason it appears that the state trier of fact did not afford the habeas applicant a full and
fair hearing. *Townsend v. Sain*, 372 U.S. 293 (1963), *overruled on other grounds by*
Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes, 504 U.S. 1 (1992), *superseded in part by statute*, 28 U.S.C. §
2254(e)(2); *see Earp v. Ornoski*, 431 F.3d 1158, 1167 (9th Cir. 2005).

1 **III. Analysis**

2 Respondents point out as an initial matter that Newell’s request for an evidentiary
3 hearing as included in his reply is inappropriate. (ECF No. 58 at 3.) A reply is not the
4 proper posture to raise claims for the first time, and the Court may utilize its discretion and
5 decline to consider any such claims. *Cacoperdo v. Demosthenes*, 37 F.3d 504, 507 (9th
6 Cir. 1994).

7 In any event, Newell’s motion fails. Newell has not demonstrated that a hearing is
8 necessary to determine the merit of his claim that retroactive application of new limitations
9 on the use of deadly force violated ex post facto principles and deprived him of a defense
10 that would otherwise have been available to him when he committed his crime. Newell
11 fails to explain how an evidentiary hearing would further establish any factual basis for his
12 for his claim. He contends that Respondents’ answering brief is “in dispute with [his] factual
13 allegations,” but he fails to recite a single factual difference between the petition and the
14 answer. (ECF No. 56 at 6.) The difference lies in the interpretation of the law as applied
15 to the facts in Newell’s case. No factual dispute exists. The record is sufficient to review
16 the state courts’ interpretation of the law and determine if the interpretation was both
17 “contrary to clearly established law” and “objectively unreasonable.” *Williams v. Taylor*,
18 529 U.S. 362, 405 (2000); *Harrington v. Richter*, 562 U.S. 86, 101 (2011).

19 Newell has had a full opportunity to provide all evidence regarding the events which
20 led up to the state courts’ alleged ex post facto application of law. Accordingly, the motion
21 for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 56) is denied.

22 **IV. Conclusion**

23 It is therefore ordered that Petitioner’s motion for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 56)
24 is denied.

25 It is further ordered that Petitioner’s motion to have the matter placed on the
26 calendar (ECF No. 59) and motion to submit case for a decision (ECF No. 60) are both
27 denied. The petition now stands brief and will be adjudicated in the ordinary course.

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that Respondents' motion to extend time to respond to the
2 motion for evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 57) is granted *nunc pro tunc*.

3 DATED THIS 16th day of MARCH 2020.

4 

5 _____
6 MIRANDA M. DU
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28